(64)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. (S) No. 1962 of 2007

Petitioners :

1. Purushottam Lal Sonwani, aged about 49 years, son of Shri Akshay Sonwani, working as Assistant Teahcer, Deptt of Tribal, Government Primary School Ambachuwan, resident of Kunkuri, Tahsil Kunkuri, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.) (Sl. No. 480 of the Impuguned Order Annexure P-1)
2. Vinod Ram, son of Late Chandru Ram, aged about 50 years, working as Assistant Teacher, Dept of Tribal, Government Primary School - Komodo, Tah. Duldula, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.) resident of Charaidand, Tah. Duldula, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.) (Sl. No. 263 of the Impuguned Order Annexure P-1)
3. Jairam Sidar, son of Jagat Ram Sidar, aged about 42 years, working as Assistant Teahcer, Tribal Department, Government Primary School - Belghutry, resident of Charaidand, Tah. Duldula, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.) (Sl. No. 441 of the Impuguned Order Annexure P-1)
4. Rajesh Khakha, son of Late Johan Khakha, aged about 40 years, working as Assistant Teahcer, Tribal Department, Govt Primary School Komodo, resident of Charaidand, Tah. Duldula, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.) (Sl. No. 360 of the Impuguned Order Annexure P-1)

Versus

Respondents

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Tribal Welfare, Dau Kalyan Singh Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

GS

2. The Assistant Commissioner, Deptt of Tribal, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)
3. Block Tribal Officer, Block Kunkuri, Distt. Jashpur (C.G.)

Present: Mr. Harish Khuntiya, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Sunita Jain, Panel Lawyer for State/respondents.

ORDER

(Passed on this 2nd Day of April, 2007)

1. The question of law involved herein asto whether the petitioners are entitled to regular pay scale w.e.f. the date of initial appointment or from the date of completion of probation period.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as for the State/respondents jointly submit that the facts and question of law involved the present writ petition are the same as to that of in W.P. (S) No. 4725/2006 (Amar Sai Ram & others Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & others), which was disposed of vide order dated 1.9.2006.

3. In view of the above-stated submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, the writ petition is disposed of in the same terms. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash